

Monogamy of nonlocal quantum correlations

BY BEN TONER

*CWI, Kruislaan 413, 1098 SJ Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Institute for Quantum Information, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena,
CA 91125, USA
(bentoner@bentoner.com)*

We describe a new technique for obtaining Tsirelson bounds, or upper bounds on the quantum value of a Bell inequality. Since quantum correlations do not allow signaling, we obtain a Tsirelson bound by maximizing over all no-signaling probability distributions. This maximization can be cast as a linear program. In a setting where three parties, A, B, and C, share an entangled quantum state of arbitrary dimension, we: (i) bound the trade-off between AB's and AC's violation of the CHSH inequality, and (ii) demonstrate that forcing B and C to be classically correlated prevents A and B from violating certain Bell inequalities, relevant for interactive proof systems and cryptography.

Keywords: quantum, nonlocality, Bell inequality, interactive proof systems

1. Introduction

One of the remarkable properties of quantum entanglement is that it is monogamous: if Alice (A), Bob (B), and Charlie (C) each have a qubit, and A and B are maximally entangled, then C's qubit must be completely uncorrelated with either A's or B's. This property is inherently nonclassical: if A, B, and C have bits instead of qubits, and A's bit is always the same as B's bit, then there is no restriction on how A's bit is correlated with C's bit. In this work, we consider the correlations that result from making local measurements on a multipartite quantum system. Some such quantum correlations violate Bell inequalities (Bell 1964). We show how these correlations, termed *nonlocal*, can also be monogamous.

Consider, for example, the well-known CHSH inequality (Clauser, Horne, Shimony & Holt 1969). Two parties, A and B, share a quantum state ρ , and each chooses one of two observables to measure on their component of the state. Define the *CHSH operator*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}} = \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes (\mathbf{B}_1 + \mathbf{B}_2) + \mathbf{A}_2 \otimes (\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{B}_2). \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ ($\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$) are A's (B's) observables and are Hermitian operators with spectrum in $[-1, +1]$. Then the CHSH inequality states that $|\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}} \rangle_{\text{LHV}}| \leq 2$, for all local hidden variable (LHV) models. There are, however, observables on an *entangled* state, e.g., the singlet state of two qubits $|\psi^-\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, such that $\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}} \rangle_{\text{QM}} = \text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}|\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-|) = 2\sqrt{2}$. Thus the correlations arising from measuring this state cannot be described by any LHV model. In fact, it is

true that $|\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}\rho)| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ for all observables $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2$, and all states ρ . Such a bound on the maximum entangled value of a Bell inequality is termed a Tsirelson bound (Cirel'son 1980). Although we do not yet know how to calculate the best such bound for an arbitrary Bell inequality, a number of ad hoc techniques have been developed (Cirel'son 1980, Tsirelson 1987, Cleve, Høyer, Toner & Watrous 2004, Buhrman & Massar 2004, Masanes 2005, Navascués, Pironio & Acín 2007, Navascués, Pironio & Acín 2008, Doherty, Liang, Toner & Wehner 2008).

In this paper, we introduce a new technique for obtaining Tsirelson bounds. Since local measurements on spatially-separated components of a multipartite quantum system can be carried out simultaneously, such measurements cannot be used to send a signal from one party to another. The outcomes of local measurements on an entangled quantum state are therefore described by a *no-signaling* probability distribution. Maximization over no-signaling probability distributions can be cast as a linear program, and so we obtain an upper bound by solving this linear program. This gives an efficient algorithm for obtaining Tsirelson bounds.

We use this new technique to study the monogamy of quantum and no-signaling correlations. Suppose three parties, A, B, and C, share an entangled quantum state of arbitrary dimension. We start by bounding the trade-off between (A and B) and (A and C)'s violation of the CHSH inequality. Thus we prove an analogue for quantum correlations of the famous theorem of Coffman, Kundu & Wootters (2000), which describes the tradeoff between how entangled A is with B, and how entangled A is with C.

In our second application, we illustrate a way to *prevent* A and B from violating a Bell inequality, even if they can share an arbitrary entangled state. We do this by introducing an extra party C, and forcing one of the parties, say B, to be classically correlated with C. For the Odd Cycle Bell inequality of Cleve et al. (2004), we prove that the presence of C prevents A and B from violating the Bell inequality *at all*. Finding methods to prevent entangled parties from violating Bell inequalities is important because it allows us to extend results about the computational hardness of computing the classical value of a Bell inequality to the quantum domain. Indeed, subsequent to the work described in this paper, Kempe, Kobayashi, Matsumoto, Toner & Vidick (2007) have used the same idea (but entirely different proof techniques) to show that it is NP-hard to calculate, or even to approximate to exponential precision, the entangled value of a 3-player Bell inequality.

Our second result also has a cryptographic interpretation. Suppose that A and B are trying to share a secret key, and that C is eavesdropping on them. If A and B observe correlations that would cause them to win the 2-player odd cycle game with probability greater than $1 - 1/2n$, then this limits how correlated C can be with B. Barrett, Hardy & Kent (2005) have presented a key distribution protocol along these lines, which is provably secure against no-signaling eavesdroppers (see also Acín, Gisin & Masanes 2006).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. After defining our framework in Section 2, we describe the linear program in Section 3. We then present our applications: in Section 4 we study monogamy of the CHSH inequality, while in Section 5 we study the Odd Cycle Bell inequality.

2. Framework

(a) Nonlocal games

We cast our results in the language of *nonlocal games*, also known as *cooperative games of incomplete information* (see Cleve et al. 2004). Let $V : \mathbb{Z}_2^m \times \mathbb{Z}_n^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function and let π be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_n^m$. Then V and π define a m -player nonlocal game $G(V, \pi)$ as follows: A referee chooses a set of questions $(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_n^m$ randomly, according to π , and sends question q_i to player i . Each player must answer with a bit a_i . The players are not permitted to communicate after receiving the questions, but they may agree on a strategy before receiving them. They win with probability $V(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m | q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ (where the $|$ in $V(\cdot | \cdot)$ separates answers from questions). The *classical value* of a game $G(V, \pi)$, denoted $\omega_c(G)$, is the maximum probability with which the players can win, assuming they use purely classical strategies. The *quantum value*, denoted $\omega_q(G)$, is the maximum winning probability, assuming they are allowed to share an arbitrary entangled state. The *no-signaling value*, denoted $\omega_{ns}(G)$, is the maximum winning probability, assuming the players are allowed (black box) access to any no-signaling probability distribution. It is clear that $\omega_c(G) \leq \omega_q(G) \leq \omega_{ns}(G)$.

(b) The CHSH game

We describe how to interpret the CHSH inequality within this framework. The CHSH game G_{CHSH} is defined by setting $n = 2$, letting π be the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ and letting $V(a_1, a_2 | q_1, q_2) = [a_1 \oplus a_2 = q_1 \wedge q_2]$, where $a_1 \oplus a_2$ is the exclusive-or of bits a_1 and a_2 , $q_1 \wedge q_2$ is the and of bits q_1 and q_2 , and $[\phi]$ is 1 if ϕ is true and 0 otherwise. Then the winning probability of a particular strategy is $1/2 + \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}} \rangle / 8$, where $\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}$ is the CHSH operator of Eq. (1.1) and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the appropriate expectation value for the strategy, classical or quantum. It follows that $\omega_c(G_{\text{CHSH}}) = 3/4$ and $\omega_q(G_{\text{CHSH}}) = 1/2 + 1/(2\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.85$.

(c) Classical correlation restricts Bell inequality violation

Consider a 2-player game $G(V, \pi)$ that is played by A and B_0 . Here we review work of Masanes, Acín & Gisin (2006), who show how forcing B_0 to be *classically* correlated with additional players $B_1, B_2, \dots$, and B_N restricts the advantage that A and B_0 can gain by sharing entanglement.

For $N \geq 1$, define the N th *extension* of a 2 player game $G(V, \pi)$ to be the $N + 2$ player game $G_N(V_N, \pi_N)$, with π_N defined by choosing (q_1, q_2) according to π and setting $q_2 = q_3 = q_4 = \dots = q_{N+2}$; and

$$V_N(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\}) = V(a_1, a_2 | q_1, q_2) \times [a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = \dots = a_{N+2}]. \quad (2.1)$$

We also set $G_0 = G$. The idea is that we send B_0 's question to the other B_i and the players win if (i) the answers A and B_0 give satisfy the winning condition of $G(V, \pi)$ and (ii) all the B_i agree.

Theorem 2.1 (Result 1 of Masanes et al. (2006)). *Let $G(V, \pi)$ be a two player game. Then the values of its extensions satisfy*

- (i) $\omega_c(G_N) = \omega_c(G)$ for all N , and

- (ii) $\omega_{ns}(G_N)$ is a nonincreasing sequence in N , with $\omega_{ns}(G_{n-1}) = \omega_c(G)$, where n is the number of questions for B_0 in G .

Terhal, Doherty & Schwab (2003), building on work of Werner (1989), earlier proved a similar result for $\omega_q(G_N)$.

3. Tsirelson bounds by linear programming

A m -party no-signaling probability distribution is a set of probabilities

$$p(\{a_i\}_{i=1}^m | \{q_i\}_{i=1}^m), \quad (3.1)$$

subject to

- (i) *Positivity*: for all $\{a_i\}$ and all $\{q_i\}$, $p(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\}) \geq 0$;
- (ii) *Normalization*: for all $\{q_i\}$, $\sum_{\{a_i\}} p(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\}) = 1$;
- (iii) *No-signaling*: For each subset $S \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$ of the m parties, the marginal probability distribution on $\mathbb{Z}_m - S$ must be independent of the inputs of the parties in S . In particular, $\sum_{\{a_i : i \in S\}} p(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\})$ must be independent of $\{q_i : i \in S\}$ for all $\{a_i : i \notin S\}$ and for all $\{q_i : i \notin S\}$.

The no-signaling value of G is given by

$$\omega_{ns}(G) = \max_p \sum_{\{a_i\}, \{q_i\}} \pi(\{q_i\}) V(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\}) p(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\}),$$

subject to the three sets of linear constraints enumerated above. We observe that $\omega_{ns}(G)$ is the solution to a linear program in variables $p(\{a_i\} | \{q_i\})$. Solving this program for $\omega_{ns}(G)$ gives an upper bound on $\omega_q(G)$. Moreover, even if we cannot solve the linear program, we can obtain an upper bound on $\omega_{ns}(G)$ by constructing a solution to the dual program (see Boyd & Vandenberghe (2004) for an introduction to convex optimization).

Note that for the CHSH game, the no-signaling value $\omega_{ns}(G_{\text{CHSH}}) = 1$ (Popescu & Rohrlich 1994), so the linear-programming technique provides only a trivial bound on $\omega_q(G_{\text{CHSH}})$.

4. An analogue of the CKW theorem for nonlocal quantum correlations

Suppose three parties, A, B, and C, each have a qubit. There is a well known theorem of Coffman et al. (2000) that describes the tradeoff between how entangled A is with B, and how entangled A is with C. It states that $\mathcal{C}_{AB}^2 + \mathcal{C}_{AC}^2 \leq 4 \det \rho_A$, where $\mathcal{C}_{AB}$ is the concurrence between A and B, $\mathcal{C}_{AC}$ is the concurrence between A and C, and ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of A.

To derive a similar expression for correlations, we consider a generalization of the CHSH game to three players, suggested by Michael Nielsen (see also Scarani & Gisin 2001). In the new game, G'_{CHSH} , the referee sends bits chosen uniformly at random to each of the three players, and with probability 1/2 checks if $a_1 \oplus a_2 =$

$q_1 \wedge q_2$ and with probability $1/2$ checks if $a_1 \oplus a_3 = q_1 \wedge q_3$. Formally, π is uniform on $\mathbb{Z}_2^3$ and

$$V(a_1, a_2, a_3 | q_1, q_2, q_3) = \frac{1}{2}[a_1 \oplus a_2 = q_1 \wedge q_2] + \frac{1}{2}[a_1 \oplus a_3 = q_1 \wedge q_3]. \quad (4.1)$$

Then the winning probability of a particular strategy is

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{16} \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}} \rangle + \frac{1}{16} \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}} \rangle, \quad (4.2)$$

where the superscripts denote on which parties the CHSH operator acts. It is easy to see that $\omega_c(G'_{\text{CHSH}}) = 3/4$ (a strategy where everyone always answers 0 achieves this, and this strategy is the best possible, by the CHSH inequality applied to AB and BC separately). It turns out that $\omega_{ns}(G'_{\text{CHSH}}) = 3/4$ too, as is easily verified using linear programming software, which implies:

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose three parties, A, B, and C share any quantum state ρ (of arbitrary dimension) and each chooses to measure one of two observables. Then*

$$|\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}}\rho)| + |\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}}\rho)| \leq 4. \quad (4.3)$$

Theorem 4.1 establishes a tradeoff between AB's and AC's violation of the CHSH inequality. In particular, CHSH correlations are monogamous: if AB violate the CHSH inequality, then AC cannot, as has already been shown for no-signaling correlations by Masanes et al. (2006). Note that if AB and AC each share an EPR pair, there are measurements such that either $\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}}\rho)$ or $\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}}\rho)$ is $2\sqrt{2}$, which at first appears to contradict Theorem 4.1. It does not: in Theorem 4.1 we insist that A's observables are the *same* in $\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}}\rho)$ and $\text{tr}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}}\rho)$. This is in the same spirit as the requirement of CKW that B and C are entangled with the same qubit of A. It is straightforward to generalize this result:

Corollary 4.2. *Suppose $N + 2$ parties $A, B_0, B_1, \dots, B_N$ share a quantum state and each chooses to measure one of two observables. Then A violates the CHSH inequality with at most one of the B_i .*

Proof. Suppose A violates the CHSH inequality with both B_j and B_k , $j \neq k$. Trace out the rest of the B_i 's. We obtain a contradiction with Theorem 4.1. $\square$

For no-signaling probability distributions, we also have a converse of Theorem 4.1: for any pair $(\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}} \rangle)$ consistent with Inequality (4.3), there is a no-signaling probability distribution with these expectation values. This is because we can write $(\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}} \rangle)$ as a convex combination of $(4, 0)$, $(0, 4)$ and $(0, 0)$, each of which is achieved by a no-signaling probability distribution. Thus Inequality (4.3) establishes precisely which values of $(\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}} \rangle)$ are allowed. For quantum theory, Toner & Verstraete (2006) have subsequently shown that the allowed region is described by $\langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AB}} \rangle^2 + \langle \mathcal{B}_{\text{CHSH}}^{\text{AC}} \rangle^2 \leq 8$.

5. The Odd Cycle Game

Our second example illustrates how violation of a Bell inequality can preclude classical correlation with another party. We start with a 2 player game based on an

interactive proof for graph colorability. Imagine that the two players, A and B, are trying to convince the referee that an odd cycle of length n is 2-colorable (which it is not, as n is odd). The referee sends them each the name of a vertex, such that the two vertices are either the same or adjacent. A and B each send one of two colors back to the referee. The referee requires that, when the vertices are the same, the two colors should agree and, when the vertices are adjacent, the colors should differ. Formally, we define a 2-player game G_{OC} as follows: Let $n \geq 3$ be an odd integer, let π be uniform over the set $\{(q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n : q_1 = q_2 \text{ or } q_1 + 1 \equiv q_2 \pmod{n}\}$ and let V be defined by $V(a_1, a_2|q, q) = [a_1 = a_2]$, $V(a_1, a_2|q, q+1) = [a_1 \neq a_2]$. It is established by Braunstein & Caves (1990) and Cleve et al. (2004) that $\omega_c(G_{OC}) = 1 - 1/2n$ and $\omega_q(G_{OC}) = \cos^2(\pi/4n)$. The Odd Cycle Game has also been considered by Feige, Kindler & O'Donnell (2007), who study its behaviour under parallel repetition.

Now consider the first extension of this game, which we denote G'_{OC} . Formally, G'_{OC} is defined by using the same distribution as G_{OC} on (q_1, q_2) , and setting $q_2 = q_3$. The function V is defined by

$$V(a_1, a_2, a_3|q, q, q) = [a_1 = a_2 = a_3], \quad (5.1)$$

$$V(a_1, a_2, a_3|q, q+1, q+1) = [a_1 \neq a_2 = a_3]. \quad (5.2)$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that $\omega_c(G'_{OC}) = \omega_c(G_{OC}) = 1 - 1/2n$. We shall show:

Theorem 5.1. *For the first extension of the odd cycle game, $\omega_c(G'_{OC}) = \omega_q(G'_{OC}) = \omega_{ns}(G'_{OC}) = 1 - 1/2n$.*

Thus sharing entanglement (or indeed no-signaling correlations) gives no advantage for G'_{OC} . This result is remarkable because it establishes that adding just one additional player is sufficient to prevent A and B from gaining advantage by sharing entanglement, rather than the $n - 1$ additional players required in Theorem 2.1. In the context of interactive proof systems, we can interpret the fact that $\omega_q(G_{OC}) > \omega_c(G_{OC})$ in the 2-player game as saying that sharing entanglement allows the provers to cheat, because it increases the probability with which they are able to convince the referee that the odd cycle is 2-colorable. Theorem 5.1 shows that we can counter this by adding an extra prover, and forcing B to be classically correlated with her. This placed no extra burden on classical provers, because an optimal classical strategy is deterministic, but it prevents quantum provers from gaining any advantage by sharing entanglement.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. There are a number of symmetries we can use to simplify the problem. Without changing the probability of winning:

- (i) all parties can flip their outputs, and/or
- (ii) all parties can add $(\text{mod } n)$ an integer m to their inputs, and/or
- (iii) B and C can exchange roles.

For a given no-signaling strategy, let $p(a, b, c|i, j, k)$ be the probability that (A,B,C) answer (a, b, c) when asked (i, j, k) . Then we can take $p(a, b, c|i, j, k)$ to be symmetric under these three symmetries. In particular, symmetry (i) implies we can restrict attention to $a = 0$, symmetry (ii) to $i = 0$. Therefore, let $r(b, c|j, k) = p(0, b, c|0, j, k)$.

We shall use symmetry (iii) to give extra constraints, rather than to reduce the number of parameters.

We rewrite the primary linear program in these variables, labeling the constraints. Our goal is to maximize

$$\omega_{ns}(G'_{OC}) = \frac{1}{2} \max_r [r(0, 0|0, 0) + r(1, 1|1, 1)], \quad (5.3)$$

subject to

- (Normalization) $n(j, k)$:

$$\sum_{b,c} r(b, c|j, k) = 1, \quad (5.4)$$

for $0 \leq j, k < n$.

- (Symmetry) $s(b, c|j, k)$:

$$r(b, c|j, k) = r(c, b|k, j), \quad (5.5)$$

for $b, c \in \{0, 1\}$, $0 \leq j, k < n$. Note that when $b = c$ and $j = k$ this constraint is trivial.

- (No-signaling conditions, A to BC) $y(d|j, k)$:

$$p(0, d|j, j+k) + p(1, \bar{d}|j, j+k) = p(0, d|0, k) + p(1, \bar{d}|0, k), \quad (5.6)$$

for $d \in \{0, 1\}$, $1 \leq j < n$, $0 \leq k < n$, where the sum $j+k$ is taken mod n .

- (No-signaling conditions, B to AC) $z(d|j, k)$:

$$p(0, d|j, k) + p(1, d|j, k) = p(0, d|0, k) + p(1, d|0, k), \quad (5.7)$$

for $d \in \{0, 1\}$, $1 \leq j < n$, $0 \leq k < n$, where the sum $j+k$ is taken mod n .

We omit the no-signaling conditions in the other directions (BC to A and AC to B), which do not further constrain the solution.

Each constraint in the primary linear program corresponds to a variable in the dual, as labeled above. The objective of the dual program is to minimize

$$\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j,k} n(j, k). \quad (5.8)$$

subject to the constraints $\mu(0, 0|0, 0), \mu(1, 1|1, 1) \geq n$, $\mu(b, c|j, k) \geq 0$, for all $b, c \in \{0, 1\}$, $0 \leq j, k < n$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(b, c|j, k) &= n(j, k) + s(b, c|j, k) - s(c, b|k, j) \\ &+ [j = 0] \sum_{j'=1}^{n-1} \left(y \left(\frac{1-bc}{2} \middle| j', k \right) + z(c|j', k) \right) \\ &- [j \neq 0] \left(y \left(\frac{1-bc}{2} \middle| j, k-j \right) + z(c|j, k) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

We now give an explicit solution to the dual. This solution was constructed by numerically solving the linear program for small n , iteratively converting the inequality constraints into a consistent set of equality conditions by generalizing from the small n solutions, and then inverting these constraints to yield the solution. While we used numerical methods to obtain the solution, we emphasize that the final solution can be checked analytically, without any need for numerical methods. The nonzero variables are:

$$n(0, 0) = 2n - 1; \quad (5.10)$$

$$s(0, 1|0, 0) = 3n/2, \quad (5.11)$$

$$s(0, 1|1, 0) = -n + 1, \quad (5.12)$$

$$s(0, 0|0, 1) = -n + 1, \quad (5.13)$$

$$s(0, 1|1, 1) = -n/2, \quad (5.14)$$

$$s(0, 0|j, j+1) = (-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; \quad (5.15)$$

$$s(0, 1|j, j+1) = -(-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; \quad (5.16)$$

$$y(0|1, 0) = -2n + 3, \quad (5.17)$$

$$y(0|1, k) = -n + k + 5/2 + (-1)^k/2 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; \quad (5.18)$$

$$y(1|1, 0) = 3 - 3n/2, \quad (5.19)$$

$$y(1|1, 1) = -n + 4, \quad (5.20)$$

$$y(1|j, 1) = -(-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (5.21)$$

$$y(1|1, k) = -n + k + 5/2 + (-1)^k/2 \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3, \dots, n-2, \quad (5.22)$$

$$y(1|1, n-1) = -n + 3, \quad (5.23)$$

$$y(1|j, n-1) = 1 - (-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1; \quad (5.24)$$

$$z(0|1, 0) = n - 3, \quad (5.25)$$

$$z(0|1, 1) = 2n - 3, \quad (5.26)$$

$$z(0|1, 2) = n - 4, \quad (5.27)$$

$$z(0|j, j-1) = -1 \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (5.28)$$

$$z(0|j, j+1) = (-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (5.29)$$

$$z(0|1, k) = n - k - 3/2 + (-1)^k/2 \quad \text{for } k = 3, 4, \dots, n-1; \quad (5.30)$$

$$z(1|j, j-1) = -1 + (-1)^j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, \quad (5.31)$$

$$z(1|1, k) = n - k - 3/2 + (-1)^k/2 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (5.32)$$

All other variables are zero.

For this solution, it's tedious but straightforward to establish that: $\mu(0, 0|0, 0) = \mu(1, 1|1, 1) = n$, $\mu(0, 1|0, 0) = 2n$, $\mu(1, 0|0, 1) = 2n - 2$, $\mu(0, 0|j, j-1) = 1 + (-1)^j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $\mu(1, 1|k+1, k) = 1 + (-1)^k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, and $\mu(b, c|j, k) = 0$, otherwise. Thus our solution satisfies the constraints. Substituting into Eq. (5.8), we find that $\omega_{ns}(G'_{OC}) \leq 1 - 1/2n$, which proves Theorem 5.1. $\square$

6. Acknowledgements

I thank Richard Cleve, John Preskill, Graeme Smith, Frank Verstraete, and John Watrous for useful suggestions, and Michael Nielsen for suggesting Theorem 4.1. This work was supported in part by the NSF under grant PHY-456720, the ARO under Grant No. W911NF-05-1-0294, the EU FP6-FET Integrated Project QAP CT-015848, NWO VICI project 639-023-302, and the Dutch BSIK/BRICKS project.

References

- Acín, A., Gisin, N. & Ll. Masanes (2006), ‘From Bell’s theorem to secure quantum key distribution’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**(12), 120405. quant-ph/0510094.
- Barrett, J., Hardy, L. & Kent, A. (2005), ‘No signaling and quantum key distribution’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010503. quant-ph/0405101.
- Bell, J. S. (1964), ‘On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox’, *Physics* **1**, 195–200.
- Boyd, S. & Vandenberghe, L. (2004), *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Braunstein, S. & Caves, C. (1990), ‘Wringing out better Bell inequalities’, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **202**(1), 22–56.
- Buhrman, H. & Massar, S. (2004), Causality and Cirel’son bounds. quant-ph/0409066.
- Cirel’son, B. S. (1980), ‘Quantum generalizations of Bell’s inequality’, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93–100.
- Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A. & Holt, R. A. (1969), ‘Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880–884.
- Cleve, R., Høyer, P., Toner, B. & Watrous, J. (2004), Consequences and limits of nonlocal strategies, in ‘Proceedings of the 19th IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC 2004)’, pp. 236–249.
- Coffman, V., Kundu, J. & Wootters, W. K. (2000), ‘Distributed entanglement’, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306.
- Doherty, A., Liang, Y.-C., Toner, B. & Wehner, S. (2008), The quantum moment problem and bounds on entangled multi-prover games, in ‘Proceedings of the 23rd IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC 2008)’.
- Feige, U., Kindler, G. & O’Donnell, R. (2007), Understanding parallel repetition requires understanding foams, in ‘Twenty-Second Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC’07)’, IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, pp. 179–192.
- Kempe, J., Kobayashi, H., Matsumoto, K., Toner, B. & Vidick, T. (2007), Entangled games are hard to approximate. arXiv:0704.2903.
- Ll. Masanes (2005), Extremal quantum correlations for N parties with two dichotomic observables per site. quant-ph/0512100.
- Ll. Masanes, Acín, A. & Gisin, N. (2006), ‘General properties of nonsignaling theories’, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**(1), 012112.
- Navascués, M., Pironio, S. & Acín, A. (2007), ‘Bounding the set of quantum correlations’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**(1), 010401.
- Navascués, M., Pironio, S. & Acín, A. (2008), A convergent hierarchy of semidefinite programs characterizing the set of quantum correlations. arXiv:0803.4290.
- Popescu, S. & Rohrlich, D. (1994), ‘Nonlocality as an axiom’, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 379.
- Scarani, V. & Gisin, N. (2001), ‘Quantum communication between n partners and Bell’s inequalities’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 117901.
- Terhal, B. M., Doherty, A. C. & Schwab, D. (2003), ‘Symmetric extensions of quantum states and local hidden variable theories’, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 157903. quant-ph/0210053.

- Toner, B. F. & Verstraete, F. (2006), Monogamy of Bell correlations and Tsirelson's bound. quant-ph/0611001.
- Tsirelson, B. S. (1987), 'Quantum analogues of the Bell inequalities. The case of two spatially separated domains', *J. Soviet Math.* **36**, 557–570.
- Werner, R. F. (1989), 'An application of Bell's inequalities to a quantum state extension problem', *Lett. Math. Phys.* **17**, 359–363.